

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PETER RODINO AND THE ISSUE
OF IMMIGRATION

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1986

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of being on a panel with the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO at Seton Hall University. The panel covered the issue of immigration and while there are many disagreements between myself and the chairman on this issue, I feel that my colleagues will find his remarks illuminating:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE PETER W.
RODINO, JR.

I am delighted to be here with you today, and I welcome this opportunity to participate in your Liberty Centennial Project.

I am particularly pleased that you have asked me to speak at this National Forum on Immigration and to discuss my immigration legislation that is currently being considered by the Congress.

I especially want to commend three of this University's distinguished alumni—Tom Giblin and Adrian (Bud) Foley for their excellent work in organizing this Forum—and Mary Jo McDonough for her tireless efforts in putting together this entire Centennial Project.

I have always felt a special attachment to Seton Hall. I am very proud that my son is an alumnus of your Law School and I will always treasure the Honorary Doctorate I received from this University in 1976.

Immigration has been a matter of deep personal interest to me ever since I first came to Congress in 1948. I truly enjoyed my years of service on the Immigration Subcommittee, and I especially value the two years in the early 70's when I served as Chairman of that Subcommittee.

It is safe to say that, other than civil rights matters no issue has occupied my attention more, during my many years in the Congress.

I find particularly appropriate the theme of your two-year project honoring the Statue of Liberty centennial—Education: The Second Passage to Liberty.

The contributions of immigrants of all nationalities to this great country are legion, and I do not intend to recite an endless litany of immigrant heroes.

Their accomplishments—whether in government, business, the arts, the sciences, or even in sports—were rendered possible by the importance they and their parents attached to education.

The millions of immigrants—the huddled masses—who poured into New York in the late 19th Century were not content with their lot in life in the Old World.

Some sought religious and political freedom. Some fled the pogroms in Russia and Eastern Europe. Others simply wanted a better life for themselves and their children.

All sought new challenges and opportunities and a future for their children, which would include liberty, economic advancement and social enrichment.

In pursuing these objectives, education always played a predominant role.

Education has provided—and continues to provide—the cornerstone in building a strong future not only for immigrants, but for all Americans.

To millions of immigrants, Freedom's Lamp held high by Miss Liberty in New York Harbor meant the end of a long voyage of suffering and hardship and the start of a new life offering freedom of thought and worship and opportunity.

Divine providence must have interceded, along with Emma Lazarus' moving poetry, to transform the Statue of Liberty—originally intended as an expression of "sympathy and affection" between France and the United States—into a beacon of hope and liberty to the new arrivals.

From 1892 to 1954, more than 17 million immigrants—including my own father—passed by the Statue and were later processed through the Great Hall at Ellis Island. Today, 40 percent of all Americans can trace their ancestry through Ellis Island.

The young immigrants who went through Ellis Island, were filled with hopes and dreams of being able to determine their own destinies in a land free of rigid social structures and economic barriers.

How many of us, first generation Americans, remember the constant prodding and almost fanatical determination of our parents in stressing the importance of education. Most of these parents who believed so strongly in educating their children has no more than two or three years of elementary school education themselves.

I am convinced that the United States has become the most educated country in the world because these early immigrants planted the education seed in the hearts and minds of their children and nurtured it so carefully.

For this reason, I am most gratified that the Ellis Island project may be oriented toward training and education, with possible plans for museums, as well as educational and conference facilities. By adopting these uses, the Statue of Liberty/Ellis Island Centennial Commission truly honors those immigrants who came through the "golden door" of Ellis Island dedicated to the work ethic and devoted to education.

[Pause]

Immigration has gone through many changes since Ellis Island. There have been many legal reforms and policy revisions.

Many of our earlier policies, I regret to say, were based on paranoia, xenophobia, and yes, even bigotry.

From 1882 through the middle of World War II, for example, federal statutes barred all natives of China from ever becoming U.S. citizens. In 1917, in an effort to exclude Hindus, legislation was enacted declaring inadmissible to the United States all natives of India and Thailand.

And then, of course, came the enactment in 1924 of the infamous National Origins Quota Law—the sole purpose of which, to

quote one supporter, was to "keep American stock up to the highest standards."

These "high standards" were to be maintained by encouraging immigration from Northern European countries and by bringing to a virtual halt immigration from Italy, Greece, Russia, Poland, Bulgaria, Armenia, Turkey, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia.

Incredibly, the National Origins Quota Law remained in effect until 1975. For my part, I will always remain proud of the role I played in striking that racist program from our statute books.

I have related these historical facts to demonstrate that American immigration policy has reflected, at different times, the best—and the worst—of human nature. It has been, at various times—open and generous—and—discriminatory and inhumane.

Indeed, no other topic of national debate has that propensity to elicit both our finest and our most vile sentiments toward our fellow man.

Unfortunately, that continues to be the case today.

The restrictionist sentiment now prevalent in the United States is engendered, to a large degree, by the magnitude of illegal migration. And make no mistake about it, illegal immigration into this country is out of control.

Border apprehensions this year will approach two million. Innumerable others will slip through undetected. The undocumented population in the United States is in the millions and growing at the rate of 500,000 per year.

Clearly, this cannot continue. No nation committed to the principles of human dignity, freedom and equality can countenance within its borders the existence of an underground population; a population unable to defend itself against vicious exploitation for fear of being discovered and deported; a population with no legal rights or privileges; in short, a population of second class citizens.

It is precisely for this reason that, for over a decade, I have supported legislation to legalize undocumented aliens already in the United States and to prevent, through employer sanctions, the reemergence of a new undocumented population once that legalization takes place.

Am I calling for a restrictionist policy? Not at all. In fact, I am calling for precisely the opposite. If anything, the number of legal immigrants to the United States should be increased.

I say that because domestic fertility rates have now reached an all-time low in our country. In fact, without immigration, the United States will begin losing population in about 35 years.

Concern in Canada about declining fertility rates and an increasing aged population has caused that country to recently increase its immigration ceiling.

Moreover, there is no empirical evidence that we have reached our immigrant absorption limit. The population density of the United States is only one-tenth that of Great Britain, for example, and only one-fifth that of Italy and France. In my mind,

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

that creates a presumption that we can accommodate more immigrants.

To understand the emotionalism, the acrimony and the myths that continuously surround the debate on immigration policy, I would like to quote the remarks of a Member of Congress on the House floor. He said:

"While a liberal immigration policy was suited to the needs of the country when it was new and unsettled, now that the United States has reached maturity and is fully populated, all immigration should be stopped."

Believe it not, that comment was made on the House Floor in the year 1797. I suspect nativist comments like this have been made each year since then and likely will continue to be made into the indefinite future.

Too often, advocates of a restrictive immigration policy are prone to blame all of the social and economic ills of this Nation on the newly-arrived immigrant or refugee.

It was exactly this type of attitude that enabled this country to retain the national origins system for almost a half century. And it is this same attitude that is now pressuring some political leaders to call for reduced immigration levels, a moratorium on immigration, or limiting family reunification—long the basic goal of our immigration policy. These pressures must be resisted.

Certainly, Congress should reexamine our system of legal immigration, to evaluate how well it has served us in recent years, but the immediate problem—and therefore the problem my bill addressed—is illegal immigration.

Virtually every industrialized nation of the Western World has enacted legislation penalizing employers who hire undocumented aliens. The notable exception to this rule is the United States.

For fifteen years I have been working for such legislation, and in 1972 and again in 1973 the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed my employer sanctions bills, only to see them die in the Senate. Presidents Ford, Carter and Reagan have all supported employer sanctions, as did a bipartisan "blue ribbon" Commission established by Congress in 1978.

Nonetheless, the concept has remained controversial. Some argue that sanctions will increase paperwork burdens on American employers. Some argue that sanctions will "lead to" a national identity card, with all its Orwellian implications. Some argue that sanctions will result in discrimination against those who "look or sound foreign." Some argue that sanctions will deprive farmers of needed foreign workers. And still others argue that employer sanctions simply will not work.

I have listened to these arguments for well over a decade and I remain convinced that—although they are made with complete sincerity—they are all without merit.

First, with regard to paperwork burdens, my bill merely requires an employer to ask a job applicant for some identifying documentation, such as a social security card or driver's license. When the employer is shown the document, he would check the appropriate box in a form supplied by the Government. He would then sign the form, as would the job applicant, and place it in his files. He is not required to determine the authenticity of the documents. If he has any question about them, he can call the Immigration Service to check them out.

Clearly, this is not the onerous and expensive burden that some members of the business community would have us believe is in this bill.

Does the bill call for a national identity card? No. In fact the bill specifically prohibits the issuance or use of a national identity card.

Will sanctions result in discrimination against minorities? I have always believed that they will not. Yet, I recognize that many individuals in good faith believe they will. Accordingly, it is essential that any sanctions legislation also create some mechanism by which individuals who feel they have been discriminated against can seek redress. My bill does just that by creating a Special Counsel in the Department of Justice to investigate and prosecute discrimination cases.

Will sanctions deprive farm owners of needed workers? I have no reason to believe they will. For years many growers have received a de facto subsidy in that they have had access to a large pool of cheap, foreign undocumented labor. This has kept farm worker wages artificially low and has also resulted in an unemployment rate among domestic migrant farm workers of almost 20 percent.

For this reason, I strongly believe a guestworker program for agriculture should not be adopted.

Will sanctions work? I'm positive they will. In a recent report, the General Accounting Office found that a majority of countries surveyed perceived sanctions as a useful tool in combatting illegal immigration.

We must close off the magnet of jobs which encourages aliens to illegally enter this country in search of employment. Certainly, it is our sovereign duty to control our borders and we must do so by enacting employer sanctions.

I do not pretend that unilateral solutions of this nature will totally solve the problem. I fully believe that bilateral approaches, including not only Mexico but other sending countries, must also be considered. I have continuously stated that we must be prepared to provide the necessary financial assistance to sending countries in order to alleviate the economic "push factors" there.

In addition to sanctions, we must have a generous and humane legalization program. Many Americans instinctively oppose this idea because, in their view, it "rewards law breakers and penalizes those who have waited patiently in line for visas."

While I understand these sentiments, they ignore the practical aspects of the problem. First, we cannot support a policy that allows millions of vulnerable people to reside in this country without the protection of our laws. Second, we cannot round up and deport millions of people, and even if it could be done, it would entail wholesale violations of the civil liberties of aliens and citizens alike. It would also require the expenditure of substantial enforcement resources—which are simply not available during these budget-cutting days.

I am fearful that unless the problem of illegal immigration is addressed by Congress now, in a courageous and straightforward fashion, the restrictionist sentiment in this country will continue to grow.

In the long run, this may have dire consequences for our legal immigration program and for our humanitarian refugee program.

We must remember that as President Kennedy once said "we are a nation of immigrants" and that these immigrants have played an important role in building this great country and in protecting our freedom.

As we celebrate the centennial of the Statue of Liberty, we must ensure that im-

migrants continue to pursue the American dream and that our country continues to be revitalized and renewed by the admission of immigrants and refugees.

We must continue to welcome people of all races, religions and backgrounds from all parts of the world.

And, we must ensure that the Statue of Liberty remains a monument to our freedom and a symbol of our deep-seated faith in, and commitment to, a just and generous immigration policy.

THE POPE AND ISRAEL

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1986

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the visit of Pope John Paul II to the main synagogue of Rome earlier this week was indeed a historic event. His call for brotherhood and his denunciation of anti-Semitism, were both welcomed and long overdue.

But the key step has yet to be taken. Justice, integrity, and decency call for full diplomatic recognition of the State of Israel by the Vatican. Pope John Paul II is a man of integrity and a man of courage. One hopes that he will not hesitate or delay in taking the only moral and right decision that can be taken in this matter.

I want to call the attention of my colleagues of an important contribution on this issue in a recent article written by Charles Krauthammer:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 18, 1986]

THE POPE AND THE JEWS

(By Charles Krauthammer)

When Pope John Paul went to the main synagogue in Rome last week, it was the first time in 2,000 years that a Pope had set foot in a synagogue. The visit was a gracious—one might even say a tender—gesture of reconciliation and friendship. The pope spoke of common bonds and mutual respect. He called Jews "our dearly beloved brothers." And he gave a most strenuous denunciation of anti-Semitism.

But something was missing from his speech, something very large. There was not a word about the central reality of Jewish life today: not a single mention of Israel. It is as if an Anglican leader came to a great meeting of reconciliation at the Vatican, spoke at length, and failed to acknowledge the existence of the spiritual focus of the Catholic world, the pope.

John Paul's speech, and particularly its denunciation of anti-Semitism, was timeless. But that is one way of saying that it was anachronistic. Such a speech could have been given, say, in 1936.

In fact, such a speech would have done much good in 1936. But in 1986 it sadly misses the point. The pope's address was fighting what, for Jews, was the last war. Up to World War II, and for a millennium, the threat to Jewish existence did indeed come from religiously borne anti-Semitism in the heart of Christian Europe. After World War II, this is no longer true.

After Auschwitz, the Jewish civilization of Christian Europe is no more. The center of that civilization has moved—once again and for the last time—to its place of origin, Israel. Today, the great threat to Jewish existence is the threat to Israel.

The war against the Jews no longer takes the form of anti-Semitic pogroms in Europe. It takes the form of the vast campaign—led by the Arab world, supported by the Soviet bloc, orchestrated by the United Nations and (apart from the United States) tolerated by the West—to delegitimize and ultimately abolish Israel.

The pope did not mention Israel because it is a touchy subject for the Vatican. It does not recognize Israel, ostensibly because the Vatican wants Jerusalem internationalized and because Israel's borders are not internationally recognized.

But of the 90 countries the Vatican fully recognizes (including, for example, Taiwan), many have disputed borders. And the West, which also has problems with Jerusalem and with Israel's borders, takes the logical position of recognizing Israel within its 1967 frontiers, and declaring the disputed territories subject to negotiation. Alone among West European states, the Vatican rejects this approach and refuses to recognize Israel.

Why? For the Vatican, the existence of a reborn Jewish state is perhaps theologically and certainly politically problematic. In part it is a question of numbers; there are a hundred million Arabs and only 4 million Israelis. The Vatican, to which the practice of *Realpolitik* has never been very foreign, can count. There are 21 Arab states, some with sizable Christian minorities. The Jews have one state only.

That state did not merit a mention at the Rome synagogue. (There is a precedent here, Pope Paul VI visited Israel in 1964, and not once during his stay in the country did he ever pronounce the name Israel.) It was right and good of the pope to denounce anti-Semitism. But anti-Semitism is the "Jewish problem" of yesterday. Anti-Zionism—the threat to the safety and legitimacy of Israel—is the Jewish problem of today.

The pope addressed the wrong Jewish problem because he implicitly took the view in his synagogue speech that Jews are exclusively a religious community. Jews have never thought so. They have always considered themselves a people.

To address Jews purely as a religious community is to deny their peoplehood. The pope obviously does so without malice. But others do so with malice. The charter of the PLO calls for the eradication of Israel and presents (Article 20) as a justification the claim that Jews belong to a religion, not a people. And religions have no claim to territory. (An awkward proposition, by the way, when applied to Vatican City.)

In 1982 the pope received the guardian of that charter, Yasser Arafat, which is bad enough. But ignoring Israel rhetorically and refusing to recognize Israel diplomatically compounds the injury. It gives unfortunate, if inadvertent, reinforcement to the premise that Jewish peoplehood is a fiction and thus Jewish statehood an error or worse.

After nearly 2,000 years of Christian anti-Semitism—the "discrimination, unjustified limitation of religious freedom, oppression" which the pope deplored in his Rome speech—something more is needed than a call for mutual tolerance between Catholic and Jew. That something is recognition of Israel, now the hinge of Jewish life and hope. The least one can do for a "dearly beloved brother" is recognize what is most dear to him.

LEGISLATION PROHIBITING THE TRANSFER OF STINGERS

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1986

Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, Late last month, Congress learned that the Reagan administration had reversed longstanding policy by deciding to furnish highly sophisticated U.S. military equipment as part of covert operations overseas. According to recent news reports, the administration plans to include Stinger missiles in this new "arsenal for democracy."

I adamantly oppose this plan and along with my colleague, Congressman DICK DURBIN, have introduced legislation to prohibit the sale or transfer of Stinger missiles to foreign paramilitary forces.

At a time when the United States is fighting an undeclared war against terrorism, worldwide, we simply cannot afford to embark on a policy that carries a risk that Stinger missiles will fall into the hands of terrorists.

The Stinger is not some outdated weapon cluttering up Pentagon warehouses. It is state-of-the-art U.S. technology, and what's more, it's a valuable weapon our own soldiers could use more of.

The Stinger works so well that when the United States supplies this weapon to Saudi Arabia in 1984, we insisted on setting strict conditions for its use. Yet, with no conditions, news reports indicate that the White House has apparently approved shipment of Stingers to guerrilla groups in Angola and Afghanistan, even though they have concluded that Stingers are too sophisticated for use by the Contras in Nicaragua.

If Congress worried about sending Stingers to a sovereign government, we should be doubly worried about supplying this weapon to guerrilla groups with shifting alliances—and shifting fortunes.

Stingers are small, they're effective and they don't require maintenance. They're a top-flight military weapon—and a perfect tool for terrorists. A Stinger would be worth its weight in gold to a madman like Mu'ammar Qadhafi.

And that's the problem. The new administration policy includes no guarantee that Stingers won't be transferred or taken from a guerrilla group our Government is supporting and given to a terrorist group we abhor. In fact, we doubt that there's any way to guarantee against it, and that's why the administration's plan is so dangerous.

In the past 12 months, we have seen terrorists pick airports, airline offices, and commercial jetliners as targets. Hundreds of people have been killed in these attacks, scores more wounded. With Stingers as part of the equation, we might as well forget about ever being able to protect the freedom of air travel.

Stingers could be easily concealed in urban areas, and because of their long range, used there against commercial airliners. Forget efforts to upgrade airport security. Metal detectors and baggage checks will offer no protection against a terrorist attack with a Stinger.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have heard time and again from administration witnesses about the need to keep

U.S. military technology from falling into the wrong hands. I have heard time and again of the need to fund and initiate a more aggressive policy to combat terrorism.

Supplying Stingers to paramilitary groups that could be easily penetrated by agents of the Soviets or of Qadhafi, does not make sense. Sale or transfer of Stingers should only be approved to meet the most vital national security needs of the United States.

By supplying Stingers as part of covert operations, the administration is increasing the chances that the Soviets, or some terrorist group, will steal one of our most effective military weapons.

I am not quarreling, in this bill, with the merits of current United States policy in Angola and Afghanistan. That's a separate issue. My sole concern is that supplying Stingers as part and parcel of these operations poses a terrorist threat to commercial air safety.

To guard against this threat, my legislation prohibits the transfer of Stingers to guerrilla or paramilitary groups. It does not impinge on the authority of the administration to conduct intelligence or military operations overseas. It does not affect current law regarding U.S. arms sales or transfers to sovereign governments. The sole purpose of the bill is to restrict the transfer of Stingers to guerrilla or paramilitary operations where we have no control over who might ultimately gain control of them, and to thwart even more ruthless attacks on passenger airlines than anything we've seen to date.

COOLING ON CHILE

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1986

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, the recent change in attitude of the Reagan Administration toward the dictatorship of General Augusto Pinochet in Chile is a welcome and refreshing one. The administration's policy, until recently, has been one of quiet diplomacy, trying to persuade General Pinochet to relinquish power after 13 years with an occasional gentle nudge. As we are all painfully aware, General Pinochet has not only ignored our nudges, but more importantly, he has ignored the cries of his own people for an early return to democratic rule.

Lately, however, the administration has taken some bold steps to illustrate U.S. frustration with the Government of Chile. It introduced a resolution in the United Nations condemning the violation of human rights in Chile, and it listed Chile as one of the few remaining dictatorships in a largely democratic hemisphere. These are clearly signals that General Pinochet can no longer ignore.

I would like to congratulate the administration for its recent moves in Chile, and to encourage it to take this policy even further. The most powerful leverage that we have over General Pinochet is the millions of dollars in loans to his government pending this year in the multilateral development banks. Let's make it clear—with deeds as well as with

words—that the United States stands with the democrats in Chile, not with the dictatorship.

The Washington Post editorial of April 2, the full text of which follows, makes the most cogent argument for an active U.S. policy in support of a return to democracy in Chile: "It is the smart way to fight communism, too."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 2, 1986]

COOLING ON CHILE

The Secretary of State now puts Chile on the list of "odd men out," the surviving dictatorships—Paraguay, Cuba and Nicaragua are the others on his list—in a hemisphere otherwise moving briskly toward democracy. It is the latest in a nearly three-year series of nudges meant to convey official American displeasure with President Augusto Pinochet's style of military rule.

Unfortunately, the nudges are necessary. In 1973 Gen. Pinochet ousted an elected president who had brought Chile to civil war by attempting to push a radical program far beyond the bounds that his narrow mandate (36 percent) could sustain. Gen. Pinochet fashioned a system that now bids to keep him in power for almost a full quarter-century. Under his painfully undemocratic constitution of 1980, the 69-year-old ramrod can have himself elected, in a plebiscite without party competition, for a term that would last, if he did, until 1997.

This prospect stirs two different groups of Chileans. Leftists see a continuing dictatorship as an opportunity to get back into revolutionary struggle. Centrists see it as a deadly obstacle to Chile's return to democracy. President Pinochet, in the name of resisting the violent communist left, restrains and oppresses the center. The left profits.

For a while after taking office, President Reagan experimented with soft gestures and quiet persuasion. The results were disappointing, and he has turned to public criticism of the regime's continuing abuses and open encouragement of an accelerated return to democracy. In practical terms, that means legalizing the nonviolent parties and holding real elections under a formula other than the one by which President Pinochet flouts Chile's established democratic traditions now.

The administration had this policy in train well before the changes in Haiti and the Philippines made people aware of the possibilities and benefits of a conservative administration's efforts to democratize right-wing regimes. Recently the administration added a rhetorical flourish to this policy with a brief but eye-catching pledge to "oppose tyranny in whatever form, whether of the left or the right," in a pronouncement on regional security.

Chile is the right country for careful American concern. The United States had at least an indirect hand in the tragedy that befell it in the 1970s; it still enjoys an influence in the 1980s. American favor and acceptance can be put to good use as inducements for Chile's return to the democratic path. It is the smart way to fight communism too.

LAKESHORE RESIDENTS NEED RELIEF NOW FROM HIGH LAKE LEVELS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1986

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we are all aware of the devastation and hardships which have been imposed on residents living near the Great Lakes as a result of the high lake levels. Because every forecast points to continued high levels at least through the summer, with no real relief in sight, our constituents will continue to wonder and worry about when the next storm or strong winds will hit, eating away at their property or destroying their homes and belongings.

My own constituents, living on the shores of Lake Erie, have been trying to cope with rising lake levels for the last several years. Many have seen their yards, piers, and stately old trees slowly, but inexorably, disappear. Then, a storm last December devastated the area. While Lake Erie dropped by eight feet at Toledo, OH, my constituents bore the brunt of an 8-foot rise in the lake at Buffalo.

The December storm caused massive amounts of damage. Homes were destroyed or severely damaged, personal belongings were lost, breakwalls were demolished, and the lake continued to lap ominously close to the peoples' homes. And, perhaps worst of all, is the knowledge that this kind of storm, with the accompanying devastation, could easily strike again. Unless you have lived through such an experience, I am sure most people can only guess at the heartbreak and trauma of such a disaster.

It has been frustrating to all of us to realize that there are few Federal or State programs established to deal with shoreline erosion and the potential flooding caused by high lake levels, combined with these storms. It also has been frustrating to realize that there is no quick, easy solution to the problem of high lake levels. There is no plug at the bottom of the lakes that we can pull so that the lake levels will subside overnight.

But, I am proud of the spirit that the millions of homeowners who live along the lakes have shown in fighting back at the lake level problem. I am also encouraged by the degree of cooperation shown among my colleagues, the U.S. Government, the Canadian Government, and the International Joint Commission in tackling this problem.

Obviously, it is not always easy to move ideas and solutions through so many different governments and agencies. But, I am confident that we have been successful in focusing everyone's attention on coming up with a long-term, permanent solution to the problem of high lake levels.

I have joined with my colleagues in pushing our Government and the Canadian Government to work for a solution to this problem. I intend to continue to work closely with the International Joint Commission in expeditiously finding a plan that will enable us to better control the levels of the Great Lakes. We cannot wait three years for another study that offers no plan of attack in dealing with this

problem. Lake levels are an emergency, and the problem demands the energy, persistence, and drive that Americans have always shown in these situations.

We also must focus on developing a response to the immediate problems caused by high lake levels. I intend to continue to work with the local communities, the New York State government, and Federal agencies in helping to repair the damage caused by the December storm and in lessening the potential damage that could be caused by future storms. I have been impressed with the initiative shown by other Great Lakes States in responding to their residents' needs, and I will continue to press for similar action by our officials in the State of New York.

I am confident that by working together we can develop better control over the levels of the Great Lakes. This is a problem that affects millions of Americans who live near the lakes and the millions more who benefit from this country's greatest natural resource. These people deserve immediate action in working to solve the problem of high lake levels.

HONORING A CHAMPION ELLWOOD CITY TEAM

HON. JOE KOLTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1986

Mr. KOLTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the champion Lincoln High School basketball team for both the achievements it and its individual players made this past season.

The team, coached by Al Campman with assistance from varsity coaches Anthony Pietrullo and Jeffery Meehan, had a record of 25 wins and five losses. This was the best record of any basketball team in the history of the school. The team, in addition, advanced the farthest it ever has in the State western regionals.

Led by players who broke scoring records and personal scoring records, and backed by unselfish players who contributed to the scoring leaders, the team—the entire team—made the community quite proud, both on the court and in the classroom. As a former teacher, I can greatly appreciate the program at Ellwood City's Lincoln High.

For all these reasons—for the outstanding individual accomplishments of some members of this team—and for the outstanding teamwork of others, for the grace and the glory, I stand before the full House of Representatives today to commend Lincoln High School's basketball team and program for its outstanding accomplishments on its road to victory. The team players are: Dan Alois, Frank Alois, John Calabria, Nick Carusone, Brian Esoldo, Mile Esoldo, Paul Fec, Larry Keller, Jim Kosior, John Roth, Doug Tammaro, and Scot Timmerman.

VETERANS WHEELCHAIR GAMES

HON. JIM MOODY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1986

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, on June 24 through 28 approximately 325 athletes, including 20 from the State of Wisconsin, will compete in the Sixth Annual National Veterans Wheelchair Games at the University of Texas at Arlington.

This event is open to all veterans with spinal cord injuries, certain neurological injuries, some orthopedic amputations and other disabilities which necessitate the use of a wheelchair for athletic competition.

During the games, the athletes will compete in track and field events, slalom, archery, bowling, billiards, table tennis, swimming, weightlifting, basketball, and other specialized events.

I would like to commend the Veterans' Administration and the Paralyzed Veterans of America for their hard work in organizing and sponsoring this opportunity for handicapped athletes to compete.

I would also like to encourage my fellow Members to join with me and follow the accomplishments of their local teams. I know that the team from Wisconsin, led by captains Donald Schmidt and Phil Rosenberg, will provide stiff competition to other entrants. I would like to draw particular attention to one Wisconsin entrant, Phil Lindsey, who in the past has qualified for the Boston Marathon.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House to join with me in congratulating the Paralyzed Veterans of America and the Veterans' Administration for putting on these 1986 games and express our best wishes and good luck to those athletes who will participate.

MEMORY AND IMAGE—AN EXHIBIT IN HONOR OF THE DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1986

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, May 6 is the "Day of Remembrance"—the time when we in the Congress of the United States and when people throughout our Nation and the world pause to remind ourselves of the potential for destruction and degradation of which humans are capable. On that day we will recall the Holocaust and recommit ourselves to be ever vigilant to insure that this darkest, most horrible tragedy is never repeated.

Many individuals have attempted to convey the unspeakable tragedy of the Holocaust in prose, in poetry, in music, in painting, and in sculpture. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress will be privileged to have available for us a unique collection of contemporary interpretive photography on the Holocaust in the Cannon Rotunda from May 6-16.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to this outstanding exhibit, which is being sponsored by the Human Rights

Caucus. The exhibit in the Cannon Rotunda will formally be opened on May 6, at 11 a.m. Elie Wiesel, the conscience of the Holocaust, will participate in that opening ceremony.

These striking and memorable images, created by Philadelphia photographer Alvin Gilens, convey a remarkable sense of beauty—as well as the stark drama of the tragedy that has left us all as survivors. This work came to my attention when it was displayed in Jerusalem at Yad Vashem, Israel's museum of the Holocaust. It has become part of their archives, making Mr. Gilens the only American photographer to be so recognized by the museum. Mr. Gilens has reproduced the exhibit for display in our Halls.

This collection of black and white photographs was taken of Holocaust sites and monuments throughout Europe, as they appear today. Mr. Gilens' mastery of light and shadow, symbolism, and subject matter makes this exhibit something more than documentation. After all, so many pictures have already been taken of the events and the people, the oppressed and the oppressors, you might ask, what more could be done? Well, I urge my colleagues to see this work to understand how even such sights and objects can be interpreted so as to convey new insights, new understandings, new ways of seeing and meaning.

The exhibit is entitled "Memory and Image." We must approach these photographs with our own memories, study the images, and reinforce our resolve. It is our responsibility to safeguard our Nation and our world to be certain that there is never a repetition of this horror.

BERN EXPERTS MEETING ON HUMAN CONTACTS OPENS

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1986

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Experts Meeting on Human Contacts convened in Bern, Switzerland, and for the next 6 weeks delegations from the 35 nations, who signed the Helsinki Final Act, will be discussing how closely nations have upheld their international commitments relating to human contacts.

This meeting is one of several meetings that was mandated by the 1980-83 Madrid Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE], which reviewed implementation of the 1975 Helsinki Final Act and it is the last of the Madrid-mandated subsidiary meetings before the next CSCE review conference convenes next November in Vienna.

The Soviet Union and its allies clearly opposed a meeting on human contacts, when it was first discussed in Madrid, and only agreed to a human contacts meeting if it was to be held at the end of the scheduled meeting. The West, however, stressed the importance of maintaining balance between the humanitarian and security aspects of the CSCE process.

The agenda at Bern will focus on the specific human contacts commitments that are outlined in the Madrid Concluding Document

and the Helsinki Final Act, including the resolution of individual cases of East-West family reunification and binational marriages, and the allowance for individuals to travel freely between nations.

We, in the Congress are all too familiar with the plight of Jews living in the Soviet Union and the struggle that they are faced with when they express the desire to emigrate, a right they are guaranteed by various international human rights agreements.

I would like to submit to the RECORD four cases that illustrate that the Soviets are not adhering to their international commitments and should be raised by the United States delegation at Bern.

Vladimir and Lifshitz: First applied to emigrate to Israel in 1981. In November 1983, Vladimir was denied work because of his application to emigrate. In January 1986, Vladimir was arrested at work, his home was searched and many items were confiscated, including correspondences from the West. He was charged with "anti-Soviet slander: for letters he wrote to Soviet authorities and to the Israeli Government. Vladimir's trial was held last month. Anna's request to appear as her husband's attorney was refused, but she was told by the judge that she would have to testify against her husband, although this request was later removed. Vladimir was sentenced to 3 years in prison, the maximum sentence for the charges against him.

Tamara Tretyakova and son, Mark Levin: Tamara is married to Mr. Simon Levin of Deerfield, IL. Tamara first applied to emigrate in February 1979 and has since been refused 14 times. Their son, Mark, who is now 7 years old, has never seen his father.

Roald Zelichonek: Roald was sentenced to 3 years in prison in August 1985, under article 190/1 (anti-Soviet slander) for letters that were confiscated from his apartment. He is now hospitalized at the camp at Komi, A.S.S.R. In January, his request for medication and a salt-free diet were denied, there have also been reports that he has been suffering from internal bleeding. Roald and his wife, Galina first applied to emigrate to Israel in 1978.

Zachar and Tatiana Zunshine: The Zunshines first applied to emigrate from the U.S.S.R. in 1981. Zachar was imprisoned on March 6, 1984, although his only crime is that he and his wife want to live in Israel. Zachar's health has been deteriorating since he has been in prison and he has been receiving insufficient medical care. Tatiana is regularly harassed and threatened by the KGB, and earlier this year she was isolated for a period of time from her Western contacts, her travel within the Soviet Union has been restricted and she has also had difficulty obtaining permission to visit her husband in the Bazoi camp.

Mr. Speaker, the Human Contacts Meeting in Bern is a forum, where we can address the flagrant violations of human rights agreements. Hopefully, we will see improved attitudes in Bern when the U.S. delegation addresses individual cases that have violated the human contacts guidelines set forth by international agreements and hopefully, these new attitudes will lead to the resolution of

many of the cases of individuals who desire to emigrate.

**THE COLLEEN GIBLIN
FOUNDATION**

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 18, 1986

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has long been proud of the capability of our citizens to overcome personal adversity and triumph with an idea which ultimately benefits humanity. Many of our greatest accomplish-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ments have begun by taking a tragic situation and channeling creative energy into achieving a positive result.

A vivid example of this type of spirit has become evident in my district with the creation of the Colleen Giblin Foundation, an organization dedicated to funding research into neurological illnesses suffered by children. The Giblin family has bravely sought to overcome a personal loss by dedicating their energies to raising money in the hope that other families will be spared the grief which they have suffered.

On Sunday, April 13, a very special fundraising event is being held, with all proceeds going to the Colleen Giblin Foundation. In-

April 18, 1986

tending to prove that laughter is indeed the best medicine, a "Toast and Roast" of New York Giant football star George Martin will be the highlight of the evening. Mr. Martin, the popular defensive end, will be toasted and roasted by his teammates, many of whom will take time out of their busy schedules to lend a hand to a most worthwhile cause.

I am honored to pay tribute to the Giblin family, George Martin, the New York Giants, and all of the people dedicated to this important organization. Their selfless devotion to making a difference is truly inspiring. I am proud to bring their efforts to the attention of my colleagues and I wish them overwhelming success in all of their endeavors.